

III. REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are pending in this application. No claims have been amended or cancelled herein. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Nishida (US Pat. No. 5,619,697).

With regard to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that Nishida fails to teach each and every feature of the claimed invention, and traverse the rejection accordingly. For example, Applicants submit that Nishida fails, *inter alia*, to teach the claimed features of "obtaining a set of rules for classifying messages on a client" and "classifying the message on the client based on the set of rules." (Claim 1, lines 3 and 5.)

Nishida teaches a real time inter-processor communication system including three processors: a first processor including a client executing means; and second and third processors, each including a server executing means. In the passage cited in the Office Action (at p. 3), Nishida discloses a "client message receiving and classifying means placed in the second processor for receiving the client messages sent from the client executing means and classifying the client messages as a request type." (Col. 5, lines 45-48.) This "second processor" functions "as a second task executing means to execute a small scale processing program of a first server." (Col. 10, lines 50-52) Therefore, as illustrated at FIG. 2, second processor 33, which is the situs of client message receiving and classifying means 40, is located on a server, rather than on the client. Accordingly, messages generated by the client executing means 36 are sent, still unclassified, via the inter-processor communication means 31 to the second processor, and are only classified upon receipt by the second processor. Nishida's system therefore requires that the rules for classifying client messages be stored on the second processor (on the first

server), rather than on a client, as classification of messages generated by the client executing means must occur, without exception, on the server rather than the client.

These features of Nishida contrast with the features of the invention of claim 1, which specifically include "obtaining a set of rules for classifying messages on a client" and "classifying the message on the client." (Claim 1, lines 3 and 5 (emphasis added).) Because Nishida clearly teaches an inter-processor communication system which is not only inconsistent with, but are also incompatible with, the practice of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that Nishida cannot anticipate the invention claimed herein. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1.

With respect to independent claims 10, 15, and 20, Applicants submit that Nishida fails, *inter alia*, to teach the feature of "separately monitoring on a server for classified messages having one of a plurality of message classifications based on the set of rules." (Claim 10, lines 4-5.) This feature is similarly recited at claim 15 ("a plurality of monitoring systems, wherein each monitoring system monitors for messages having a unique message classification," lines 4-5) and at claim 20 ("program code for separately monitoring a plurality of ports on a server for classified messages," lines 5-6).

As discussed above with respect to claim 1, and as illustrated at FIG. 2, Nishida teaches "client executing means ... for sending a plurality of request type of client messages to the second processor" (col. 5, lines 41-43), and "client message receiving and classifying means ... for receiving the client messages sent from the client executing means and classifying the client messages as a request type" (*id.*, lines 45-48). Therefore, according to Nishida's teachings, it would not be possible or effective to "separately monitor[] on a server for classified messages," as recited in claim 10 herein, because the messages received on Nishida's server are not yet

classified. Further, Nishida's teachings include receipt of the message by the client message receiving and classifying means 40, followed by forwarding of the message to indication/request type message mail box means 41, and subsequently to server executing means 42 (*see* FIG. 2). Nowhere does Nishida disclose any type of "monitoring on a server," as recited at claim 10. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of independent claims 10, 15, and 20 for the above-stated reasons.

With respect to dependent claim 3, Applicants submit that Nishida further fails to teach the feature of "periodically requesting an updated set of rules from the server" (claim 3, lines 1-2). As is clear in Nishida's FIG. 2, client message receiving and classifying means 40 is stored on the server, rather than on the client. As discussed above relative to claim 1, this requires that Nishida's rules for classifying client messages must also be stored on the server (on the second processor 33), rather than on the client. Accordingly, updates to those rules would also necessarily need to be directed to client message receiving and classifying means 40 on the server, rather than to the client. This method is entirely inconsistent with the method of the claimed invention, which teaches "obtaining a set of rules for classifying messages on a client," (recited at claim 1, line 2 and incorporated by reference into claim 3), and "periodically requesting an updated set of rules from the server."

Applicants further note that the passage cited by the Office in the rejection of claim 3 fails to disclose anything regarding updates whatsoever, let alone the feature of "periodically requesting an updated set of rules from the server." Instead, it discusses "client executing means placed in the first processor for sending a plurality of request type of client messages to the second processor in sequence to request a plurality of services for processing a plurality of events," (col. 5, lines 41-44), which does not involve rules or a need for updating.

Because Nishida accordingly does not teach the claimed feature of “requesting an updated set of rules...”, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claim 3 under § 102(b).

With respect to dependent claim 5, Applicants submit that Nishida fails to teach the feature of “adjusting a port for the message based on the classification prior to the sending step” (claim 5, line 1-2). As with respect to the claims discussed above, Applicants submit that the invention of claim 5 teaches “classifying messages on a client” and “sending the message to the server based on the message classification,” (claim 1, lines 2 and 5), limitations which are incorporated by reference into claim 5. These features are not taught by Nishida, who instead teaches classification of client messages by client message receiving and classifying means which are located on the server. Because Nishida’s client messages are not classified until after they are forwarded to the server, it is clear that it would not be possible to send the message to the server “based on the message classification” (claim 1, line 5) that has not yet been applied, much less “adjust[] a port for the message based on the classification” (claim 5, lines 1-2).

Applicants further note that the passage cited by the Office in the rejection of claim 5 fails to disclose anything regarding ports or adjustment thereof whatsoever, let alone the feature of “adjusting a port for the message based on the classification prior to the sending step.” Instead, it discusses “message receiving and classifying means 55 for receiving a plurality of response type of first server messages sent from the task executing means 54 of the processors (Ps) functioning as servers,” (*see generally*, col. 17, lines 2-24), which does not involve ports or a need for adjusting the same.


Because Nishida clearly fails to teach this feature of the invention of claim 5, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 5 under § 102(b).

With respect to dependent claims 2, 4, 6-9, 11-14, 16-19, 21, and 22, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are allowable for reasons stated above relative to independent claims 1, 10, 15, and 20, as well as for their own additional claimed subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) to claims 2, 4, 6-9, 11-14, 16-19, 21, and 22.

IV. CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the Application as presented is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that anything further is necessary in order to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



John W. LaBatt
Reg. No. 48,301

Date: November 12, 2007

(JMT)

Hoffman, Warnick and D'Alessandro, LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
Phone: (518) 449-0044
Fax: (518) 449-0047